

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 17-21, 29, 31-40, 45, 47, and 49-50 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated December 13, 2006, all pending claims were rejected. With this amendment, Applicants cancel claims 29, 31-36, 45, 47, and 49-50.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 17-21, 37-40, and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pitkow et. al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to dependent claims 13 and 38, and have amended independent claims 1 and 37 to incorporate their elements. Claim 1 thus recites:

“providing the personalized search result and the general search result; and selecting an advertisement for display responsive to the personalized search object.”

and claim 37 now recites:

“providing the personalized search result and the general search result; and providing an advertisement based at least in part on the search result.”

Advertisements selected in response to personalized search objects are likely to be more relevant and interesting to users than general advertisements. As a result, a user is more likely to click on or select such ads, improving the searching experience from the perspective of the user and the advertiser.

Pitkow fails to disclose these elements. The portion of Pitkow used to reject claims 17 and 38 describes a normalized content vector representing the aggregate contents of all bookmarks pertaining to a user or group. (20:20-21) While this section makes reference to a “content collection,” which is described as the collective content of a group, there is no mention or suggestion of providing or selecting an advertisement, much less doing so “responsive to the personalized search object” or “based at least in part on the search result” as presently claimed. Pitkow is devoid of any mention of advertising; in fact, a word search of Pitkow in its entirety

shows that the terms “advertisement,” “ad” or “advertising” do not even appear. For at least this reason, claims 1 and 37, and the remaining claims that depend on them, are patentable over the reference.

Pitkow also fails to teach other elements of the dependent claims, for instance the step of “identifying a user cluster based at least in part on the personalized search object and providing to the user a suggestion of another user with which to network based on the user cluster” of claim 18. While the portion of Pitkow cited for this element generally discloses the concept of a group profile (20:14), it makes no mention of “providing to the user a suggestion of another user with which to network.” This provides an additional independent ground of patentability to claim 18.

For these reasons, reconsideration and the early allowance of all claims herein are requested. If the Examiner believes that direct contact with the Applicants’ attorney will advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned as indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
Gregory Joseph Badros et. al.

Dated: 2/13/07

By: /Colleen Chien/
Colleen V. Chien, Reg. No. 55,062
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2319
Fax: (415) 281-1350
Email: cchien@fenwick.com